UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,380	08/28/2006	Todd Garrett Simpson	ZICO0014	6475

22862 7590 11/25/2011

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
WRIGHT, BRYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/25/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomatters@glenn-law.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,380	SIMPSON, TODD GARRETT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRYAN WRIGHT	2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/9/2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14,17,18,21 and 24-26* is/are pending in the application.

5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,14,17,18,21 and 24-26* is/are rejected.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/9/2010 has been entered. Claims 1 and 18 are amended. Claims 4-13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are cancelled. Claims 1-3, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 24-26 are pending

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouse et al. (US Patent No. 6,983,310 and Rouse hereinafter) in view of Avidan (EP 1006704 A2) (cited from IDS) and further in view of Narusawa (US Patent No. 6,823,183).

2. As to claim 1, Rouse teaches a information identification system, comprising:

a first information-search software module which includes executable instructions to identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching function provided through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

a second information-search software module (e.g., calendar module) which includes executable instructions to identify a second set of information corresponding (e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53-65);

Rouse does not teach:

a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user, wherein the user interacts with said platform-framework in a computer environment;

a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user,

a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data,

wherein the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Avldan. Avldan is noted to teach with respect to applicant's claim limitation of: “a platform-framework software module which includes executable instructions to receive input from a user, wherein the user interacts with said platform-framework in a computer environment”; the capability to receive user in input [par. 18, lines 20-23];

Avldan is noted to teach with respect to applicant's claim limitation of: :”a data-type software module which includes executable instructions to identify types of data that might be returned to the user”, the capability of identify data that is returned to the user [par. 18, lines 24-35];

Avldan is noted to teach with respect to applicant's claim limitation of: “:a service-descriptor software module which includes executable instructions to identify valid actions corresponding to each identified type of data, the capability of identifying a valid action corresponding to each data type of data. See paragraph 19, lines 45-55;

With regard to applicant's claim limitation element of:

"wherein the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment “, the Examiner notes paragraph 18 of applicant's specification where the applicant implies that the environment is the

application the user has selected. The environment/ application can be a phone book dialer where the user enters a number and based on number enter by the applicant a list of numbers are displayed. If the environment/ application is a browser than if the user enters a letter, then the system will return a domain name. As such the Examiner notes Avldan's disclosure in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, where Avldan discloses both a number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment) The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses a if the user enters a number in the phone dialer than the system will use the number entered to anticipate the phone number the user is attempting to retrieve. The same capability applies for applicant's browser application where if system returns a domain name based on the user input);

With regards to applicant newly amend claim limitation of:

“wherein the ordering of the first set of information and the second set of information is based on the environment, so that the system reacts differently depending upon the environment”, again the Examiner notes paragraph 18 of applicant's specification where the applicant implies that the environment is the application the user has selected. The environment/application can be a phone book dialer where the user enters a number and based on number enter by the applicant a list of numbers are displayed. If the environment/application is a browser than if the user enters a letter, then the system will return a domain name. As such the Examiner notes Avldan's disclosure in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, where Avldan discloses both a

number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment) The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses a if the user enters a number in the phone dialer than the system will use the number entered to anticipate the phone number the user is attempting to retrieve. The same capability applies for applicant's browser application where if system returns a domain name based on the user input. Additionally the Examiner notes that each application (e.g., environment) will have it own display requirements (e.g., the data will organize differently in application/environment). A phone number dialer application will have a different data display arrangement than a web browser application.

With regards to applicant's claim limitation elements of:

the types of data including, universal resource locator, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user; and

wherein a group of possible valid actions include each of searching, searching a database universal resource locators and names of locations and addresses; The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, both a number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment). The Examiner notes that in order for Avldan predictive capability to work, Avldan must inherently maintain a data structures which consist of names, phones numbers and domain names that can be easily searched to predict a sufficient response based on the user input.

Therefore, given the teachings of Rouse as described above, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse to enhance system capability by employing the well known features of predictive word completion as disclosed above by Avldan.

The combination of Rouse and Avldan discloses the capability to search a name and phone number database however the combination does not expressly teach:

a user interface, capable of listing one of the first and second sets of information at the top of a display and the other set of information at the bottom of the display with a cursor provided at the top of the display, so as to provide the sets of information to the user such that the set of information at the top of the display is more easily accessed by the user than the other set of information,

However at the time of applicant's original filing the ability to search specific data types in a wireless phone environment was well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the combination of Rouse and Avldan as introduced by Narusawa. Narusawa discloses:

Narusawa is noted to teach with regards to applicant's claim limitation of:"a user interface, capable of listing one of the first and second sets of information at the top of a display and the other set of information at the bottom of the display with a cursor provided at the top of the display, so as to provide the sets of information to the user such that the set of information at the top of the display is more easily accessed by the

user than the other set of information", the capability to display a list of data item from top to bottom. See figure 4, lines 204. The Examiner notes that conventional display position the cursor position relative to the top of the display for the user to enter data. The Examiner notes that Narusawa is noted to disclose conventional display means. See figure 4.

Therefore given the present teachings of both Rouse and Avldan to provide predictive user action capability in a wireless phone environment, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the teachings of both Rouse and Avldan to enhance the user action prediction process by employing the well known feature of various data type searching as disclosed above by Narusawa.

Claims 2, 3, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouse and Avldan and in view of Narusawa, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of and further in view of Bradford et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2006/0247915 and Bradford hereinafter).

3. As to claim 2, the teaching of Rouse, Avldan and Narusawa discloses a system with predictive word capability however the system does not discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is providing input.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse, Avldan and Narusawa as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system further comprising a platform-aware software module which includes executable instructions to identify an environment in which the user is providing input (to provide the capability to identify the setting mode of an user environment [par. 44]).

Therefore, given the system disclosed by Rouse, Avldan and Narusawa, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the system to enhance system capability, by employing the well known features of identifying a user environment setting mode as disclosed above by Bradford..

4. As to claim 3, Rouse teaches a system where the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment (e.g., calendar module) [col. 10, lines 53-60].

5. Claims 4-13, (cancelled)

6. As to claim 14, Rouse's discloses predictive input capability however Rouse's system does not disclose:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A system where the executable instructions of the first information search software module include instructions to parse a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

7. Claims 15 and 16, (cancelled)

8. As to claim 17, Rouse's discloses predictive input capability however Rouse's system does not disclose: A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A learning software module, which includes executable instructions to track preferences of the user and determine from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide learning capability for user preference [par. 40; par. 43]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of learning a user action for purpose of predictive correlation as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40; par. 43].

Claims 18, 21 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rouse, Bradlford in view of Narusawas and further in view of Avldan.

9. As to claim 18, Rouse teaches a computer-implemented method of identifying information in a computer environment, comprising: providing a processor configured for performing the steps of: identify a first set of information corresponding to a first one of the identified valid actions (e.g., entered character string) (i.e., ...teaches a searching function through executable software loaded on a mobile device [col. 10, lines 25-40]);

identify a second set of information corresponding (e.g., viewing option) to a second one of the identified valid actions (col.. 10, lines 53-65);

Rouse does not teach:

receive input from a user; identify types of data that might be returned to the user;

identify valid actions corresponding to each type of data identified,

identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information:

removing the duplicate information from the second set of information,

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

to receive input from a user (to provide a device having a display and user information input mechanism (par. 28));

identify types of data that might be returned to the user (to provide a menu containment structure for possible user selectable elements (par. 40)),

identify valid actions corresponding to each type of data identified, (to provide executable software means for identifying a user action corresponding to a selectable menu elements (par. 41));

identifying duplicate information, the duplicate information being information that appears in the first set of information and the second set of information, removing the duplicate information from the second set of information (to provide duplicate information recognition and suppression (e.g., removal) capability [par. 146]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of predictive word and user action as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

The combination of Rouse and Bradford do not expressly teach:

a user interface, capable of listing one of the first and second sets of information at the top of a display and the other set of information at the bottom of the display with a cursor provided at the top of the display, so as to provide the sets of information to the user such that the set of information at the top of the display is more easily accessed by the user than the other set of information

However at the time of applicant's original filing, the ability to search specific data types in a wireless phone environment was well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the combination of Rouse and Bradford as introduced by Narusawa. Narusawa discloses:

Narusawa is noted to teach with regards to applicant's claim limitation of :"a user interface, capable of listing one of the first and second sets of information at the top of a display and the other set of information at the bottom of the display with a cursor provided at the top of the display, so as to provide the sets of information to the user such that the set of information at the top of the display is more easily accessed by the user than the other set of information", the capability to display a list of data item from top to bottom. See figure 4, lines 204. The Examiner notes that conventional display position the cursor position relative to the top of the display for the user to enter data. The Examiner notes that Narusawa is noted to disclose conventional display means. See figure 4.

Therefore given the present teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to provide predictive user action capability in a wireless phone environment, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the teachings of both Rouse and Bradford to enhance the user action prediction process by employing the well known feature of various data type searching as disclosed above by Narusawa.

The system of Rouse, Bradford and Narusawa do not expressly teach:

the types of data including, universal resource locator, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user; and

wherein a group of possible valid actions include each of searching, searching a database universal resource locators and names of locations and addresses;

Identifying an environment in which the user is providing input and wherein the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment and wherein the ordering of the first set of information and the second set of information is based on the environment, so that the system reacts differently depending upon the environment.

However in this instance the Examiner notes the teachings of Avldan.

With regards to applicant's claim limitation elements of:

the types of data including, universal resource locator, names of locations and addresses based on input from the user; and

wherein a group of possible valid actions include each of searching, searching a database universal resource locators and names of locations and addresses; The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, both a number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment). The Examiner notes that in order for Avldan predictive capability to work, Avldan must inherently maintain a data structures which consist of names,

phones numbers and domain names that can be easily searched to predict a sufficient response based on the user input.

With regard to applicant's claim limitation element of " Identifying an environment in which the user is providing input and wherein the data-type software module includes executable instructions to select the types of data based on the environment“, the Examiner notes paragraph 18 of applicant's specification where the applicant implies that the environment is relative to the application the user has selected. The environment or equivalent application can be a phone book dialer where the user enters a number and based on number enter by the applicant a list of numbers are displayed. If the environment or equivalent application is a browser than if the user enters a letter, than the system will return a domain name. As such the Examiner notes Avldan's disclosure in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, where Avldan discloses both a number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment) The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses a if the user enters a number in the phone dialer than the system will use the number entered to anticipate the phone number the user is attempting to retrieve. The same capability applies for applicant's browser application where if system returns a domain name based on the user input);

With regards to applicant newly amend claim limitation of: “wherein the ordering of the first set of information and the second set of information is based on the environment, so that the system reacts differently depending upon the environment”,

again the Examiner notes paragraph 18 of applicant's specification where the applicant implies that the environment is relative to the application the user has selected. The environment or equivalent application can be a phone book dialer where the user enters a number and based on number enter by the applicant a list of numbers are displayed. If the environment or equivalent application is a browser than if the user enters a letter, than the system will return a domain name. As such the Examiner notes Avldan's disclosure in paragraphs 1-5, lines 5-55, where Avldan discloses both a number dialing application (e.g., environment) capability and a browser selection application (e.g., environment) The Examiner notes that Avldan discloses a if the user enters a number in the phone dialer than the system will use the number entered to anticipate the phone number the user is attempting to retrieve. The same capability applies for applicant's browser application where if system returns a domain name based on the user input. Additionally the Examiner notes that each application (e.g., environment) will have it own display requirements (e.g., the data will organize differently in application/environment). A phone number dialer application will have a different data display arrangement than a web browser application.

Therefore, given the teachings of Rouse, Bradford and Narusawa as described above, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying the system to enhance system capability by employing the well known features of predictive word completion as disclosed above by Avldan.

As to claim 19 and 20 (cancelled).

10. As to claim 21, Rouse's discloses predictive input capability however Rouse's system does not disclose:

A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified. However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses: A method further comprising parsing a database of information from which the first set of information is identified (to provide database checking (e.g., parsing) for a first set of information identified [par. 72]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of database parsing as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 72].

11. Claims 22 and 23, (cancelled).

12. As to claims 24-26, Rouse's discloses predictive input capability however Rouse's system does not disclose:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (claim 26).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Rouse as introduced by Bradford. Bradford discloses:

A method further comprising tracking preferences of the user and determining from the preferences whether the sets of information should be provided to the user such that the second set of information is more easily accessed by the user than the first set of information (to provide user preference tracking capability [par. 43]) (claim 24).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the frequency with which the user selects information from the sets (to provide user input tracking capability [par. 40]) (claim 25).

A method where tracking preferences is accomplished by tracking the recently selected information from the sets (to provide the capability to track previous entries action performed by a user [par. 40]) (claim 26).

Therefore, given the teachings of Bradford, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Rouse by employing the well known features of user action tracking as disclosed above by Bradford, for which predictable word input will be enhanced [par. 40].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 14, 17-21, and 24-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is (571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Flynn Nathan can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/
Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/NATHAN FLYNN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431